Single machine slack due-window assignment and scheduling of linear time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a deteriorating maintenance activity

Bo Cheng* and Ling Cheng†

*School of Informatics

Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

Guangzhou 510420, China

Email: bocheng@gdufs.edu.cn

†School of Electrical and Information Engineering

University of the Witwatersrand

Private Bag 3, Wits. 2050, Johannesburg, South Africa

Email: ling.cheng@wits.ac.za

arXiv:1405.0712v1 [cs.DS] 4 May 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the slack due-window assignment model and study a single machine scheduling problem of linear time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a deteriorating maintenance activity. The cost for each job consists of four components: earliness, tardiness, window location and window size. The objective is to schedule the jobs and to assign the maintenance activity and due-windows such that the total cost among all the jobs is minimized. A polynomial-time algorithm with the running time not exceeding $O(n^2 logn)$ to give a solution to this problem is introduced, where n is the number of jobs.

Index Terms

deteriorating job, due-window, maintenance activity, single-machine scheduling

I. Introduction

Competition in market place prompts the studies on operations management to improve customer service. One important objective of operations management in practice is to finish jobs as close as possible to their due-dates. Usually a time interval is assigned in the supply contract so that a job completed within the time interval will be

considered on time and not be penalized. The time interval is called the due-window of a job. The due-window assignment methods include common due-window, slack due-window (also called common flow allowance) and others. Some relevant references are [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11]. [12] presented a polynomial-time solution to find the optimal schedule and the optimal due-window size such that the total cost is minimized. [13] considered the slack due-window problem and gave an $O(nlogn)$ time complexity solution.

In classical scheduling theory, job processing times are considered as constants. However, a steadily growing interest on solving scheduling problems with changeable job processing times has been witnessed in the last decade. Recently, [14] studied the single machine common due-window assignment problem with learning effect and deteriorating jobs. They gave polynomial-time algorithms to minimize costs for earliness, tardiness, window location and window size. [15] considered the parallel problem for the slack due-window model.

[16] initiated research on machine scheduling with a rate-modifying activity. Since then, researchers have applied the concept of rate-modifying activity to other scheduling settings involving various performance measures ([17], [18], [19], [20]). In this paper, the maintenance activity considered is different from the rate-modifying activity. It can be described as follows. Assume that there is at most one maintenance activity throughout the schedule. Maintenance activity can be performed immediately after the completion of any job. However, the position and starting time of the maintenance activity are decided by the scheduler. The machine reverts to its initial conditions after the maintenance activity including machine deterioration. See [21], [22] and [23].

The combinations of the above-mentioned settings have been considered in the following recent literatures. Common due-window assignment and scheduling with simultaneous considerations of time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a rate-modifying activity was studied in [24]. Slack due-window assignment and scheduling with considerations of variable processing-time jobs and a rate-modifying activity was considered in [25]. Common due-window assignment and scheduling with simultaneous considerations of time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a maintenance activity was investigated in [23]. In this paper, the problem of slack due-window assignment and single-machine scheduling considering time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a maintenance activity is presented. To our best knowledge, this problem has not been studied in literatures.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, a description of the problem is given. In Section III some important lemmas and properties are presented. In Section IV, a polynomial-time solution for the problem is given. A numerical example is presented to demonstrate the polynomial-time solution in Section V. The research is concluded and future study is foreseen in the last section.

II. Model formulation

There are n jobs $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n$ to be processed on a single machine. All the jobs are available for processing at time zero and no preemption is allowed. The job processing times are assumed to follow a linear time-dependent deteriorating model. Then, the actual processing time of job J_j is determined by

$$p_j = a_j + bt, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \tag{1}$$

where a_j is the normal processing time of job J_j, b is a common deteriorating factor for all the jobs, and $t \geq 0$ is the starting time of job J_j.

The due window of job J_j is specified by a pair of non-negative real numbers $[d_j^{(1)}, d_j^{(2)}]$ such that $d_j^{(1)} \leq d_j^{(2)}$. For a given schedule π, $C_j = C_j(\pi)$ denotes the completion time of job J_j, $E_j = max\{0, d_j^{(1)} - C_j\}$ is the earliness value of job J_j, $T_j = max\{0, C_j - d_j^{(2)}\}$ is the tardiness value of job J_j, and $D_j = d_j^{(2)} - d_j^{(1)}$ is the due-window size of job J_j. For the slack due-window method, the window starting time for job J_j is defined as the sum of its processing time p_j and a job-independent constant $q^{(1)}$:

$$d_j^{(1)} = p_j + q^{(1)}, \tag{2}$$

and the due window completion time for J_j is defined as the sum of its processing time and a job-independent constant $q^{(2)} > q^{(1)}$:

$$d_j^{(2)} = p_j + q^{(2)}. \tag{3}$$

Then $D_j = q^{(2)} - q^{(1)}$, for $j = 1, \ldots, n$, i.e., the window size is identical for all the jobs. Let $D = D_j$.

Furthermore, the following assumptions have been made for this problem: (i) the machine will revert to its initial conditions after the maintenance activity and machine deterioration will start anew, (ii) there is at most one maintenance activity throughout the schedule, and (iii) the maintenance duration is a linear function of its starting time and is given by $f(t) = \mu + \sigma t$, where $\mu > 0$ is the basic maintenance time, σ is a maintenance factor, and t is the starting time of the maintenance activity.

The objective function consists of four cost components, i.e. (i) earliness E_j, (ii) tardiness T_j, (iii) the starting time of the due-window $d_j^{(1)}$, and (iv) the due-window size D. Let $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$, $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ represent the earliness, tardiness, due-window starting time and due-window size costs per unit time respectively. The general objective is to determine the optimal $q^{(1)}$ and $q^{(2)}$, the optimal location of the maintenance activity, and the optimal schedule to minimize the total cost function

$$Z = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\alpha E_j + \beta T_j + \gamma d_j^{(1)} + \delta D). \tag{4}$$

Using the three-field notation of [26], the problem under study is denoted as $1 \mid SLK, p_j = a_j + bt, ma \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\alpha E_j + \beta T_j + \gamma d_j^{(1)} + \delta D)$, where SLK and ma in the second field denote the slack due-window method and maintenance activity, respectively.

For convenience, we define $\sum_{j=s}^{t} x_j = 0$ if $t < s$.

III. Properties of an optimal solution

In this section some properties for an optimal schedule are obtained.

Lemma 1: If $C_j \geq d_j^{(2)}$ for a given job order $\pi = (J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n)$, then $C_{j+1} \geq d_{j+1}^{(2)}$.

Proof: We have

$$C_{j+1} \geq C_j + p_{j+1} \geq d_j^{(2)} + p_{j+1}$$
$$= q^{(2)} + p_j + p_{j+1} = d_{j+1}^{(2)} + p_j \geq d_{j+1}^{(2)}$$

□

Similar to the proof of Lemma 1, we have

Lemma 2: If $C_j \leq d_j^{(1)}$ for a given job order $\pi = (J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n)$, then $C_{j-1} \leq d_{j-1}^{(1)}$.

Consider a job sequence $\pi = (J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n)$. Assume that $C_s \leq q^{(1)} \leq C_{s+1}$ and $C_t \leq q^{(2)} \leq C_{t+1}$. Then the total cost Z is a linear function of $q^{(1)}$ and $q^{(2)}$, and thus an optimum is obtained either at $q^{(1)} = C_s$ or $q^{(1)} = C_{s+1}$ and either at $q^{(2)} = C_t$ or $q^{(2)} = C_{t+1}$.

Therefore we obtain the following result, whose proof is similar to the one in [13].

Lemma 3: (i) For any given schedule, the optimal values of $q^{(1)}$ and $q^{(2)}$ are determined by the completion times of the k'th and l'th jobs ($l \geq k$).

(ii) An optimal schedule exists with no idle time between consecutive jobs and starts at time zero.

For a number a, $\lfloor a \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer not more than a.

Lemma 4: $k = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\delta-\gamma)}{\alpha} \right\rfloor$ and $l = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\beta-\delta)}{\beta} \right\rfloor$

Proof: Shift $q^{(1)}$ to the left by Δ time units, where $0 < \Delta < p_k$. As a result, the overall cost Z has been changed by $(\delta n - n\gamma - \alpha k)\Delta$. Since $q^{(1)} = p_1 + p_2 + \cdots + p_k$ is optimal, it implies that $(\delta n - n\gamma - \alpha k)\Delta \geq 0$, and hence $k \leq \frac{n(\delta-\gamma)}{\alpha}$.

Shift $q^{(1)}$ to the right by Δ time units, where $0 < \Delta < p_{k+1}$. As a result, the overall cost Z has been changed by $(\alpha(k+1) + n\gamma - \delta n)\Delta$. We obtain $(\alpha(k+1) + n\gamma - \delta n)\Delta \geq 0$, and hence $k \geq \frac{n(\delta-\gamma)}{\alpha} - 1$. Then $k = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\delta-\gamma)}{\alpha} \right\rfloor$.

In the similar way, we can prove $l = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\beta-\delta)}{\beta} \right\rfloor$ by using the standard perturbation method. □

Lemma 5: Suppose that sequences $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ and $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n$ are given except in arrangement. The sum of the products of the corresponding elements $\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j y_j$ is minimized if the sequences are monotonic in opposite senses.

Proof: See page 261 in [27]. □

IV. Optimal solution

For a job scheduled in the rth position in a sequence, $p_{[r]}$ and $a_{[r]}$ denote the actual processing time and the normal processing time of the job, respectively. All the jobs are available for processing at time zero. By Lemma 4, the locations of k and l can be calculated. Let i be the position of the last job preceding the maintenance activity.

If the position of the maintenance activity is before k (i.e., $i < k$), then the total cost is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}(\alpha E_j + \beta T_j + \gamma d_j^{(1)} + \delta D) \\ &= \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{k}(p_{[j]} + q^{(1)} - C_{[j]}) + \beta\sum_{j=l+1}^{n}(C_{[j]} - p_{[j]} - q^{(2)}) \\ &+ \gamma\sum_{j=1}^{n}(q^{(1)} + p_{[j]}) + n\delta(q^{(2)} - q^{(1)}) \\ &= \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{k} jp_{[j]} + \alpha i(\mu + \sigma\sum_{j=1}^{i} p_{[j]}) + \beta\sum_{j=l+1}^{n}(n-j)p_{[j]} \\ &+ \gamma(n(\mu + \sigma\sum_{j=1}^{i} p_{[j]}) + (n+1)\sum_{j=1}^{k} p_{[j]} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} p_{[j]}) + n\delta\sum_{j=k+1}^{l} p_{[j]} \\ &= n\mu\gamma + \alpha i\mu + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\omega_j p_{[j]}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where

$$\omega_j = \begin{cases} \alpha j + \alpha i\sigma + \gamma n\sigma + (n+1)\gamma & 1 \le j \le i \\ \alpha j + (n+1)\gamma & i < j \le k \\ \gamma + n\delta & k < j \le l \\ \beta(n-j) + \gamma & l < j \le n. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

If $k \le i < l$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{k} jp_{[j]} + \beta\sum_{j=l+1}^{n}(n-j)p_{[j]} + \gamma\left((n+1)\sum_{j=1}^{k} p_{[j]} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} p_{[j]}\right) \\ &+ n\delta(\mu + \sigma\sum_{j=1}^{i} p_{[j]}) + n\delta\sum_{j=k+1}^{l} p_{[j]} \\ &= n\delta\mu + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\omega_j p_{[j]}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where

$$\omega_j = \begin{cases} \alpha j + \gamma(n+1) + n\delta\sigma & 1 \le j \le k \\ \gamma + n\delta\sigma + n\delta & k < j \le i \\ \gamma + n\delta & i < j \le l \\ \beta(n-j) + \gamma & l < j \le n. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

If $l \leq i \leq n$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{k} j p_{[j]} + \beta \left(\sum_{j=l+1}^{n} (n-j) p_{[j]} + (n-i)(\mu + \sigma \sum_{j=1}^{i} p_{[j]}) \right) \\ &+ \gamma \left((n+1) \sum_{j=1}^{k} p_{[j]} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n} p_{[j]} \right) + n\delta \sum_{j=k+1}^{l} p_{[j]} \\ &= (n-i)\beta\mu + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j p_{[j]}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$\omega_j = \begin{cases} \alpha j + \beta(n-i)\sigma + \gamma(n+1) & 1 \leq j \leq k \\ \beta(n-i)\sigma + \gamma + n\delta & k < j \leq l \\ \beta(n-j) + \beta(n-i)\sigma + \gamma & l < j \leq i \\ \beta(n-j) + \gamma & i < j \leq n. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Note that $i = n$ means no maintenance activity is necessary in the schedule. Given the processing time $a_{[j]}$, the actual processing time $p_{[j]}$ of the scheduled j'th job can be given as follows.

$$p_{[j]} = a_{[j]} + b \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} (1+b)^{t-1} a_{[j-t]}, \tag{11}$$

where $1 \leq j \leq n$, and

$$m = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j \leq i \\ j - i & \text{if } j > i. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Combining (5), (7) and (9) and using (11), we obtain

$$Z = M + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j p_{[j]} = M + \sum_{j=1}^{n} W_j a_{[j]}, \tag{13}$$

where

$$M = \begin{cases} n\mu\gamma + \alpha i\mu & i < k \\ n\delta\mu & k \leq i < l \\ (n-i)\beta\mu & l \leq i \leq n, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

the positional weight

$$W_j = \omega_j + b \sum_{t=j+1}^{m'} \omega_t (1+b)^{t-j-1}, \tag{15}$$

and

$$m' = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq i \\ n & \text{if } i < j \leq n. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

From the above analysis and the rearrangement inequality (Lemma 5), the problem $1 \mid SLK, p_j = a_j + bt, ma \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\alpha E_j + \beta T_j + \gamma d_j^{(1)} + \delta D)$ can be solved by the following algorithm.

Algorithm 1.

Step 1. By Lemma 4, get the values of $k = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\delta-\gamma)}{\alpha} \right\rfloor$ and $l = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\beta-\delta)}{\beta} \right\rfloor$.

Step 2. Set $i = 1$.

Step 3. For $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, obtain the positional weights W_j according to (15).

Step 4. Renumber the jobs in non-decreasing order of their normal processing times a_j. By Lemma 5, arrange the job with the largest normal processing time to the position with the smallest value of W_j, the job with the second largest normal processing time to the position with the second smallest value of W_j, and so forth. Then, obtain a local optimal schedule and the corresponding total cost.

Step 5. $i = i + 1$. If $i \leq n$, then go to Step 3. Otherwise, go to Step 6.

Step 6. The optimal schedule is the one with the minimum total cost.

Then we have the following result.

Theorem 1: Algorithm 1 solves the problem $1 \mid SLK, p_j = a_j + bt, ma \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n}(\alpha E_j + \beta T_j + \gamma d_j^{(1)} + \delta D)$ in $O(n^2 \log n)$ time.

Proof: The correction of Algorithm 1 is guaranteed by Lemmas 3 - 5. The running time of Steps 1 and 3 is $O(n)$, and the time complexity of Step 4 is $O(n \log n)$. Since the maintenance activity can be scheduled immediately after any one of the jobs, n different positions of the maintenance activity must be considered and evaluated to obtain the global optimal solution until Step 6. Hence, the time complexity for solving the $1 \mid SLK, p_j = a_j + bt, ma \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n}(\alpha E_j + \beta T_j + \gamma d_j^{(1)} + \delta D)$ problem is $O(n^2 \log n)$. □

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, Algorithm 1 is demonstrated by the following example.

Example 1. There are $n = 9$ jobs. The normal processing times of jobs are $a_1 = 62$, $a_2 = 81$, $a_3 = 25$, $a_4 = 82$, $a_5 = 26$, $a_6 = 19$, $a_7 = 55$, $a_8 = 9$ and $a_9 = 91$. Let the common deteriorating factor $b = 0.05$. The penalties for unit earliness, tardiness, due-window starting time and due-window size are $\alpha = 4$, $\beta = 15$, $\gamma = 5$ and $\delta = 6$, respectively. The basic maintenance time is $\mu = 10$ and the deteriorating maintenance factor is $\sigma = 0.1$.

Solution: By Lemma 4, we have the locations of $k = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\delta-\gamma)}{\alpha} \right\rfloor = 2$ and $l = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\beta-\delta)}{\beta} \right\rfloor = 5$. In the following we explain the cases $i = 1$, $i = 3$ and $i = 6$ and the other cases are similar. If $i = 1$, the maintenance time is immediately after the first job is finished. Since $i < k$, according to (6), we have $\omega_1 = 58.9$, $\omega_2 = 58.0$, $\omega_3 = 59.0$, $\omega_4 = 59.0$, $\omega_5 = 59.0$, $\omega_6 = 50.0$, $\omega_7 = 35.0$, $\omega_8 = 20.0$ and $\omega_9 = 5.0$, and we obtain $W_1 = 58.9000$, $W_2 = 73.9324$, $W_3 = 71.3642$, $W_4 = 67.9659$, $W_5 = 64.7294$, $W_6 = 53.0756$, $W_7 = 36.2625$, $W_8 = 20.2500$ and $W_9 = 5.0000$. Based on Algorithm 1, we have the local optimal sequence is (7,8,6,3,5,1,2,4,9) and the total cost is $Z = 17476.37$. If $i = 3$, the maintenance time is immediately after the third job is finished. Since $k < i$, according to (8), we have $\omega_1 = 59.4$, $\omega_2 = 63.4$, $\omega_3 = 64.4$, $\omega_4 = 59.0$, $\omega_5 = 59.0$, $\omega_6 = 50.0$, $\omega_7 = 35.0$, $\omega_8 = 20.0$ and $\omega_9 = 5.0$, and we obtain $W_1 = 65.9510$, $W_2 = 66.6200$, $W_3 = 64.40000$, $W_4 = 67.9659$, $W_5 = 64.7294$, $W_6 = 53.0756$, $W_7 = 36.2625$, $W_8 = 20.2500$ and $W_9 = 5.0000$. Based on Algorithm 1, we have the local optimal sequence is (3,6,7,8,5,1,2,4,9) and the total cost is $Z = 17634.66$. If $i = 6$, the maintenance time is immediately

after the sixth job is finished. Since $l < i$, according to (10), we have $\omega_1 = 58.5$, $\omega_2 = 62.5$, $\omega_3 = 63.5$, $\omega_4 = 63.5$, $\omega_5 = 63.5$, $\omega_6 = 54.5$, $\omega_7 = 35.0$, $\omega_8 = 20.0$ and $\omega_9 = 5.0$, and we obtain $W_1 = 75.4469$, $W_2 = 75.6637$, $W_3 = 73.0131$, $W_4 = 69.5362$, $W_5 = 66.2250$, $W_6 = 54.5000$, $W_7 = 36.2625$, $W_8 = 20.2500$ and $W_9 = 5.0000$. Based on Algorithm 1, we have the local optimal sequence is (6,8,3,5,7,1,2,4,9) and the total cost is $Z = 18271.87$.

TABLE I

THE CORRESPONDING LOCAL OPTIMAL JOB SEQUENCES AND TOTAL COSTS WITH ONE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY AT ALL POSSIBLE POSITIONS IN EXAMPLE 1.

i	Job sequence	Z
1	(7,8,6,3,5,1,2,4,9)	<u>17476.37</u>
2	(7,5,8,6,3,1,2,4,9)	17525.07
3	(3,6,7,8,5,1,2,4,9)	17634.66
4	(6,8,3,7,5,1,2,4,9)	17749.44
5	(6,8,3,5,7,1,2,4,9)	18157.92
6	(6,8,3,5,7,1,2,4,9)	18271.87
7	(6,8,3,5,7,1,2,4,9)	18347.63
8	(6,8,3,5,7,1,2,4,9)	18170.85
9	(6,8,3,5,7,1,2,4,9)	17519.13

As shown in Table I, all the local optimal job sequences and the corresponding total costs are presented, among which the optimal total cost is underlined. The global optimal solution for this example includes the following: (i) the job sequence is (7,8,6,3,5,1,2,4,9) and the corresponding job starting time and actual processing time are (0.00, 70.50, 79.50, 98.95, 125.37, 154.12, 220.30, 308.79, 402.70) and (55.00, 9.00, 19.45, 26.42, 28.74, 66.18, 88.49, 93.91, 107.61), respectively; (ii) the slack window parameters are $q^{(1)} = 79.50$ and $q^{(2)} = 154.12$; (iii) the maintenance activity is located immediately after the first job (i.e. Job 7), starting at time $t = 55.00$ and ending at time $t = 70.50$; (iv) the total cost is $Z = 17476.37$.

VI. CONCLUSION

We solved a single machine slack due-window assignment and scheduling problem of linear time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a deteriorating maintenance activity, and gave a polynomial-time algorithm. The running time of this algorithm does not exceed $O(n^2 logn)$. Further research may consider the problem with the setting of parallel identical machines, or the problems with min-max type objective functions.

REFERENCES

[1] T. C. E. Cheng, "Optimal common due-date with limited completion time deviation," *Computers & operations research*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 91–96, 1988.

[2] S. Liman, S. Panwalkar, and S. Thongmee, "Common due window size and location determination in a single machine scheduling problem," *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 49, pp. 1007–1010, 1998.

[3] W.-K. Yeung, C. Oguz, and T. C. E. Cheng, "Minimizing weighted number of early and tardy jobs with a common due window involving location penalty," *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 108, no. 1-4, pp. 33–54, 2001.

[4] ——, “Single-machine scheduling with a common due window,” *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 157–175, 2001.

[5] W. K. Yeung, C. Oguz, and T. C. E. Cheng, “Two-stage flowshop earliness and tardiness machine scheduling involving a common due window,” *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 421–434, 2004.

[6] W.-K. Yeung, C. Oguz, and T. C. E. Cheng, “Two-machine flow shop scheduling with common due window to minimize weighted number of early and tardy jobs,” *Naval Research Logistics (NRL)*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 593–599, 2009.

[7] W.-K. Yeung, T.-M. Choi, and T. C. E. Cheng, “Optimal scheduling of a single-supplier single-manufacturer supply chain with common due windows,” *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 2767–2777, 2010.

[8] E. Gerstl and G. Mosheiov, “Due-window assignment with identical jobs on parallel uniform machines,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 229, no. 1, pp. 41–47, 2013.

[9] ——, “An improved algorithm for due-window assignment on parallel identical machines with unit-time jobs,” *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 113, no. 19, pp. 754–759, 2013.

[10] D.-L. Yang, C.-J. Lai, and S.-J. Yang, “Scheduling problems with multiple due windows assignment and controllable processing times on a single machine,” *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 150, pp. 96–103, 2014.

[11] Y. Yin, T. C. E. Cheng, C.-C. Wu, and S.-R. Cheng, “Single-machine due window assignment and scheduling with a common flow allowance and controllable job processing time,” *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2013.

[12] G. Mosheiov and A. Sarig, “A multi-criteria scheduling with due-window assignment problem,” *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 898–907, 2008.

[13] G. Mosheiov and D. Oron, “Job-dependent due-window assignment based on a common flow allowance,” *Foundations of Computing and Decision Sciences*, vol. 35, pp. 185–195, 2010.

[14] J.-B. Wang and C. Wang, “Single-machine due-window assignment problem with learning effect and deteriorating jobs,” *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 4017–4022, 2011.

[15] J.-B. Wang, L. Liu, and C. Wang, “Single machine SLK/DIF due window assignment problem with learning effect and deteriorating jobs,” *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, vol. 37, no. 18, pp. 8394–8400, 2013.

[16] C.-Y. Lee and V. Leon, “Machine scheduling with a rate-modifying activity,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 128, no. 1, pp. 119–128, 2001.

[17] G. Mosheiov and D. Oron, “Due-date assignment and maintenance activity scheduling problem,” *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 1053–1057, 2006.

[18] G. Mosheiov and A. Sarig, “Scheduling a maintenance activity and due-window assignment on a single machine,” *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 36, no. 9, pp. 2541–2545, 2009.

[19] G. Mosheiov and J. B. Sidney, “Scheduling a deteriorating maintenance activity on a single machine,” *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 882–887, 2010.

[20] M. Ji and T. C. E. Cheng, “Scheduling with job-dependent learning effects and multiple rate-modifying activities,” *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 110, no. 11, pp. 460–463, 2010.

[21] S.-J. Yang, D.-L. Yang, and T. C. E. Cheng, “Single-machine due-window assignment and scheduling with job-dependent aging effects and deteriorating maintenance,” *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 37, no. 8, pp. 1510–1514, 2010.

[22] C.-L. Zhao and H.-Y. Tang, “Single machine scheduling with general job-dependent aging effect and maintenance activities to minimize makespan,” *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 837–841, 2010.

[23] T. C. E. Cheng, S.-J. Yang, and D.-L. Yang, “Common due-window assignment and scheduling of linear time-dependent deteriorating jobs and a deteriorating maintenance activity,” *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 135, no. 1, pp. 154–161, 2012.

[24] C.-L. Zhao and H.-Y. Tang, “A note to due-window assignment and single machine scheduling with deteriorating jobs and a rate-modifying activity,” *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1300–1303, 2012.

[25] B. Mor and G. Mosheiov, “Scheduling a maintenance activity and due-window assignment based on common flow allowance,” *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 135, no. 1, pp. 222–230, 2012.

[26] R. L. Graham, E. L. Lawler, J. K. Lenstra, and A. Kan, “Optimization and approximation in deterministic sequencing and scheduling: a survey,” *Annals of discrete mathematics*, vol. 5, pp. 287–326, 1979.

[27] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*. Cambridge university press, 1934.